REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on March 17,2006, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-5, 7-19, 21-29, 31-41, 43-47, 49-53, 55-57, 59 and 60-63 are pending in this Application. Claims 1, 19, 25, 41, 47, 53 and 56 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claims 61-63 have been added. A version of the claims containing markings to show the changes made is included hereinabove. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended Applicants representative during a telephone call on July 17, 2006 wherein the advisory action was discussed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 7-19, 21-29, 31-41, 43-47, 49-53, 55-57 and 59-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,023,507 to Wookey (hereinafter Wookey).

Wookey discloses an automatic remote computer monitoring system. In Wookey, as shown in Figure 3 and described at column 4, line 46 through column 5, line 50, discloses a database system which includes a firewall, in which diagnostic information from the monitored system is transmitted back to the service system and stored.

The Examiner stated that Wookey discloses the limitations of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement. Claim 1 includes the steps of obtaining connection information for a data communications device, initiating a first **packet communications session** using the connection information, providing to the data communications device the first packet communications session authentication information such that the data communications device can determine if a user of the computer system is authorized to establish the first packet communications session and allowing the computer system to establish a second packet communications session from the data communications device to the data storage system when the user is

authorized or denying the ability to establish a second packet communications session from the data communications device to the data storage system when the user is not authorized (emphases added). Stated more simply, claim 1 recites establishing a first packet communications session between a first device (the computer system) and a second device (the data communications device) if the user is authorized, and if the user is authorized then establishing a second communications session between the second device (the data communications device) and a third device (the data storage system).

In contrast to claim 1, Wookey discloses establishing a modem session between a first device (the service center computer system) and a second device (the modem of the monitored system) if the user is authorized, and then establishing a second communications session between the second device (the modem of the monitored system) and first device (the service center computer system). The modem session of Wookey is not a packet communication session since the modem session is an analog session taking place over a phone line. The first modem session of Wookey does not utilize packets.

Therefore, since Wookey discloses establishing a modem (e.g., non-packet based) session between a first device and a second device if the user is authorized, and then establishing a second communications session between the second device and first device, while claim 1 recites establishing a packet communications session between a first device and a second device if the user is authorized, and if the user is authorized then establishing a second communications session between the second device and a third device, claim 1 is believed allowable over Wookey.

Claims 19, 25, 41, 47, 53 and 56 include similar language as claim 1 regarding establishing a packet communications session between a first device and a second device if the user is authorized, and if the user is authorized then establishing a second communications session between the second device and a third and are believed allowable over Wookey for the same reasons. Claims 2-5, 7-18, 21-24, 26-40, 43-46, 49-52, 55 and 57 depend from claims 1, 19, 25, 41, 47, 53 or 56 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Therefore, the

rejection of claims 1-5, 7-19, 21-29, 31-41, 43-47, 49-53, 55-57 and 59-60 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wookey is believed to have been overcome.

Claims 61-63 have been added. Support for these claims can be found in the specification as files, for example at page 22, lines 5-17. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

In view of the above, the Examiners objections and rejections are believed to have been overcome, placing claims 1-5, 7-19, 21-29, 31-41, 43-47, 49-53, 55-57 and 59-60 and 61-63 in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants hereby petitions for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 40,150
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: EMC01-41(00024)

Dated: July 17, 2006